

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

NADINE BONDS,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	Case No.:
)	
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,)	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
)	JURY TRIAL
Defendant)	
		(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

COMPLAINT

NADINE BONDS (“Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. (“Defendant”):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff’s Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* (“FDCPA”).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before “any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy,” and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Indianapolis, Indiana, 46220.
7. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
8. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).

9. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.

10. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.

11. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

12. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and

abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

13. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a “debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a “debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a “debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

14. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that “[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors,” which “contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.

15. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to “eliminate abusive debt

collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.

17. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

18. Beginning in or before November 2010, and continuing through April 2011, Defendant, its agents, employees, and servants, repeatedly and continuously contacted Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment of a debt.

19. Defendant, its employees and agents harassed the Plaintiff by making continuous calls to her home telephone number almost every day, causing Plaintiff to receive, on average, two (2) collection calls a day.

20. As a result of Defendant's continuous and repeated telephone calls, Plaintiff regularly received at least ten (10) collection calls a week from Defendant, causing her to receive more than twenty (20) collection calls a month.

21. Plaintiff received phone calls and voicemail messages from Defendant on numerous occasions.

22. In addition, on numerous occasions, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her home phone using automated telephone equipment.

23. Defendant left automated voice messages on Defendant's home phone

announcing that it was calling in an attempt to collect a debt and asking Plaintiff to contact Ed Blanchard.

24. When Plaintiff called Mr. Blanchard, she would get a voicemail that either no one is available to take the call or mailbox is full, which further harassed Plaintiff since she wanted to speak with Defendant to learn about the alleged debt it was seeking to collect.

25. Most recently, on April 26, 2011, at 12:45 p.m., Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone in an attempt to collect a debt.

26. Further, in its communications with Plaintiff, Defendant failed to notify Plaintiff of the amount of debt, the name of the company to whom the debt was owed, or that she had the right to dispute the debt and/or request validation of the debt.

27. Within five (5) days of its initial communication with Plaintiff, Defendant failed to send Plaintiff written notification of her rights to dispute the debt and/or requests verification of the debt.

28. To date, Plaintiff has still not received a letter notifying her of her rights to dispute and/or seek verification of the debt.

29. To date, Plaintiff still has not received any information regarding the underlying debt Defendant sought to collect from her.

30. Plaintiff disputes owing a debt to Defendant or to the entity that placed an account with Defendant for collection.

31. When Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone, it did so with the intent to annoy, abuse and harass Plaintiff.

32. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were

harassing, and highly deceptive.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

33. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). “Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages.” Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector’s legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

34. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). “Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 *et seq.*, is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer.” Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

35. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the “least sophisticated” consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not “made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character,

nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced.” Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318

COUNT I
DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

36. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
- b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
- c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff’s telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- d. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- e. Defendant violated §1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send written notification, within five (5) days after its initial communication with Plaintiff, advising Plaintiff of her rights to dispute the debt or request verification of the debt;
- f. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable

manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, NADINE BONDS, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, NADINE BONDS, demands a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

DATED: 8-25-11

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By: CTK 3654
Craig T. Kimmel
Attorney ID #57100
30 E. Butler Pike
Ambler, PA 19002
Phone: (215) 540-8888
Fax: (877) 788-2864
Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com